

against American soldiers stationed in Iraq.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLINE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURGESS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FEENEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FEENEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### THE BATTLE OF ANTIETAM (SHARPSBURG), SEPTEMBER 17, 1862, "THE BLOODIEST DAY OF THE CIVIL WAR"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to commemorate the single bloodiest day in American combat history—the Battle of Antietam—September 17th, 1862. We are a product of our history and we can learn a lot from this terrible day in 1862.

On this day 141 years ago, nearly 100,000 Americans met at Antietam creek near Sharpsburg, Maryland. In a battle that lasted less than twelve hours, over 23,000 Americans lay dead or wounded.

More than twice as many Americans were killed or mortally wounded in combat at Antietam as in the War of 1812, the Mexican War, and the Spanish-American War combined. Amazingly more Americans were killed or wounded at Antietam than on June 6, 1944—D Day on the Normandy beaches in World War II.

	Union	Confederate	Total
Killed .....	2,100	1,550	3,650
Wounded .....	9,550	7,750	17,300
Missing .....	750	1,020	1,770
Total .....	12,400	10,320	22,720

#### CHRONOLOGY OF THE BATTLE—WHAT HAPPENED

On September 17, Union Major General George McClellan confronted Lee's Army of Northern Virginia at Sharpsburg, Maryland. At dawn, Hooker's Corps mounted a powerful assault on Lee's left flank. Attacks and counterattacks swept across Miller's cornfield and fighting raged throughout the day around the Dunker church. After repeated delays a Union corps under Burnside finally got into action and attempted to cross the stone bridge over Antietam creek and roll the Confederate right.

Union General Ambrose Burnside's corps of 12,000 men tried to cross the 12 foot wide

bridge over Antietam creek for 4 hours. About 450 Georgian sharpshooters took up positions behind trees and boulders on a steep wooded bluff overlooking the bridge. Greatly outnumbered the Confederates drove back several Union advances toward the bridge.

#### CONFEDERATE EYEWITNESS: BURNSIDE BRIDGE

Lieutenant Theodore T. Fogle, 2nd Georgia Infantry: "At a bridge on the Antietam Creek our Regiment and the 20th Ga., in all amounting to not over 300 muskets held them in check for four hours and a half and then we fell back only because our ammunition was exhausted, but we suffered badly, eight cannon just 500 yards off were pouring grape shot, shell and canister into us and our artillery could not silence them. We held our post until Major William Harris ordered us to fall back. Our Col. (Col. Holmes) . . . was killed about half an hour before. . . .

"We went into the fight with only 89 muskets and had eight officers and 35 men killed and wounded. So many of the men were shot down that the officers filled their places and loaded and fired their guns."

After horrific losses the union forces finally punched through and moved on Sharpsburg. But General McClellan had hesitated too long, allowing General Lee to consolidate his vulnerable forces and counterattack into Burnside's flank and rear. McClellan then hesitated once again, failing to pursue a retreating Lee. The opportunity for total victory was gone.

The Union's General McClellan hesitated many times that day. He lacked the courage to accept short term sacrifice even when it meant the long term salvation of the nation. As a result, the Confederate Army escaped that day and the war lasted another three bloody years.

This day in history reminds us that decisive leadership can save lives, end wars and prevent future attacks.

Today, we must continue to recognize that the survival of our nation is again challenged. President Bush and our military leaders have shown that they have the courage to face the reality of our world.

Last Friday at Fort Stewart Georgia President Bush said: "We are not waiting for further attacks on our citizens. We are striking our enemies before they can strike us again. Wars are won on the offensive—and America and its friends are staying on the offensive."

By taking the fight to our enemies we are diminishing our foes, securing our people and building the hope of people across the globe.

We owe the security of our nation and our way of life to the hosts of Americans who have unselfishly served and died. We are blessed to have those soldiers in our ranks once again and we are blessed that their leaders understand what is at stake for the nation and the world.

#### IRAQ PRINCIPLES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to begin the Congressional Black Caucus's Special Order to address the President's proposal to spend an additional \$87 billion for the war in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, since the President addressed the Nation on September 7 regarding the war in Iraq, the Congressional Black Caucus has carefully evaluated the current state of where we are in Iraq and established a set of principles that we believe should be our guide as we move forward.

Before I get into the substance of our principles, I want to recognize the diligent work of the Congressman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) for his leadership in drafting these principles and working very carefully with other members of the caucus to come to consensus. He willingly took on the task of synthesizing and framing the views of 39 Members of Congress. That is not an easy task. The Congressman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) handled it masterfully. I also want to thank all the members of the Congressional Black Caucus who helped us to get where we are today. It truly was a team effort.

Mr. Speaker, in October of last year, the Congressional Black Caucus issued a statement of principles with respect to any decision to go to war with Iraq. Although most of us were prepared to support broad-based international action sanctioned by the United States National Security Council, we opposed the unilateral first strike by the United States without first receiving clearly demonstrated evidence of an imminent threat of attack upon the United States.

At that time the Bush administration had not presented us with the evidence that we needed, both constitutionally and morally, to support its plan. It has not done so, I must note, to this day.

We argued last year that absent clear evidence of an imminent threat to the people of the United States, a unilateral first strike against Iraq would undermine the international moral authority of the United States that is so critical in our struggle against terrorism.

We were deeply apprehensive that the Middle East would be destabilized, that unilateral U.S. action would commit this Nation to a long-term and, perhaps, indefinite foreign engagement that would cost America dearly both in American lives and in national resources.

Last year's concerns have now become this year's harsh realities, realities that we must face as a Nation and that we must overcome.

On almost a daily basis we hear regretfully about American soldiers who are being killed or injured in Iraq. The Bush administration has been unable or unwilling to truly internationalize the process toward restoring control of Iraq to the Iraqi people. As a Nation, we are already scores of billions of dollars poorer than we were last October. Now the Bush administration has presented the Congress with another \$87 billion check that it is asking us to sign. There is no question that we, along with our other colleagues in the Congress, will do everything within our power to support and protect our troops and provide for their families. That is a paramount concern for us, always has been and always will be. Our duty in this regard is clear.

Nevertheless, before the Congress of the United States provides the President with the authority to spend more of the American people's money on Iraq, we have a constitutional responsibility to demand a clear, comprehensive, and publicly articulated analysis of the Bush administration's management of our involvement both past and present.

The administration does not even pretend that this \$87 billion proposal will be its final request for funds. Before I proceed, I would like to make two points that I recently read in *The Washington Post*. In this particular piece it was noted that the \$87 billion request by the President is three times the amount of money the Federal Government will spend on elementary and secondary education this year, and two times as much as the budget for homeland security. The article also noted research from Yale economic researcher William Nordhaus, which noted that the \$166 billion that has been spent, or requested, exceeds the inflation-adjusted cost of the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Civil War, the Spanish American War, and the first Persian Gulf War combined, and approaches the \$191 billion inflation-adjusted cost of World War I.

Mr. Speaker, I note these facts and the professor's research to say if left unquestioned, approving this \$87 billion would amount to another blank check. That cannot be allowed to happen.

To state the matter gently, the administration has suffered serious damage to its credibility on the subject of Iraq. As a first step toward repairing this loss of trust, the American people and their elected representatives deserve to know in far greater detail the information that convinced the President to go to war.

In addition, the President must provide us with a far more detailed game plan for the future. He should outline his reasoned predictions as to the personnel and funding that will be required to complete our involvement in Iraq and the manner in which these burdens and the authority to address them will be shared with the United Nations. The President should provide

an accounting of the previously appropriated funds which this administration has expended in Iraq, including details of all Federal contracts. The President should explain to the Congress and the American people how the additional \$87 billion in funding that he has now requested will be spent.

The Bush administration should provide the Congress with the information that will allow us to evaluate and vote separately upon the funding requested for the protection and support of our troops as distinguished from the funding that the President wishes to apply to the rebuilding of Iraq. We also deserve a full accounting of the Iraqi resources, both recovered and anticipated, that properly can be utilized to reduce the U.S. burden.

Above all, our troops and the American people as a whole deserve to know the President's exit strategy. We need to know the criteria for success that must be met before the President will agree to bring our men and women home.

We ask these questions of the Bush administration with the respect that should exist between coequal branches of our government. Those in the world who oppose America should not underestimate either our national unity or our resolve. Nevertheless, both in Baghdad and in my hometown of Baltimore, these are hard times for the American people, times that demand hard answers to hard questions.

Mr. Speaker, we who serve the people in the Congress of the United States would not be fulfilling our constitutional responsibility if we were to hand the President another blank check. We must have some accountability for the American people's money.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), chairman emeritus of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my concerns about the President's request for \$87 billion to pursue the administration's aims in Iraq. While I strongly support our troops and I stand here as a strong American, and I support the President when it is reasonable and I will continue to support those brave Americans who are getting themselves in harm's way to defend our Nation, I think we must ask ourselves some fundamental questions.

To this end, the Congressional Black Caucus has issued a statement of principles as to the war in Iraq. I embrace these principles fully. I was Chair of the caucus when we adopted our principles concerning the war, and we still hold those principles dear. I am deeply concerned about the cost of the war and the cost of the psyche of the people of this Nation. I am also concerned about the economic price tag the war is exacting on the taxpayers. We are shifting the cost of engagement to our children and grandchildren. We are burdening ourselves with a debt that is

not only mind boggling; it is also unconscionable.

Mr. Speaker, keep in mind that the \$87 billion in new funding that the President is requesting from Congress includes more than twice the 2004 budget for the Department of Homeland Security. It is also roughly triple the proposed appropriations for highways and roads. Keep in mind that the combined projected costs of the theaters of operations in Iraq and Afghanistan through September 2004 is \$166 billion. That includes the \$87 billion.

□ 1745

The President has not provided Congress with sufficient details about how the proposed funding will be spent. The information we have been given is vague, perhaps purposely so. Therefore, we are not able to separately evaluate the proposed funding for the protection and maintenance of our troops and proposed funding for rebuilding Iraq. In my view, Congress should vote on these funding proposals separately.

Back home, people think that the greatest attention we can give the troops is to bring them home. They really do not want more money spent in Iraq. Moreover, the administration has not articulated an exit strategy, nor has it given us a blueprint or a plan for bringing our troops home. That is what the people want. It was said in the days of old, "My people perish for a lack of knowledge." We are left in that position. Without the information, we are groping in the dark. The American people deserve better and so does Congress. We should not give a blank check one more time for the President to spend with his friends.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to put some of the numbers in perspective. I serve on the Committee on the Budget and have looked at these numbers from the perspective of the budget. To put these in perspective, let us begin with the first Persian Gulf war, Desert Storm. The total cost of that war, \$61.1 billion. Because we had international cooperation, we paid 12 percent of that cost, \$7.4 billion. 12 percent. The first supplemental that we have already spent in the current Iraqi conflict, \$79 billion. We have been asked for \$87 billion more, a total of \$166 billion. If we had had international cooperation, 12 percent of \$166 billion is \$20 billion. Because of the administration's decision to go it alone and attack unilaterally, a \$20 billion problem has become a \$166 billion problem. And so I commend the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus for asking what efforts will be made to develop the multilateral force that can share in this burden.

In addition, because we are already into deficit spending, this administration should articulate how the costs of

the war will be borne. If we are going to just borrow the money, then we have to recognize the context of borrowing additional money. In early 2001, budget projections were that within 10 years, we would run up a \$5 trillion surplus, enough to pay off the entire national debt, meaning that we would have no interest on the national debt after about 2013. Because we have gone back to deficit spending instead of paying off the national debt, we have increased the national debt such that the interest on the national debt that we will be paying by 2013, instead of zero, will be about as much as we are spending for national defense. In that context, if we are going to borrow the money, let us recognize that we are going to have to pay interest on \$166 billion at around 4 percent interest. That equals to over \$6.5 billion a year, over \$100 million every week, just in interest, without paying off the principal, just in interest for as far as the eye can see.

Let us put some of these numbers also in perspective as to what we spend on other priorities. \$166 billion between the supplemental we have spent and the request that is before us. \$166 billion. The Department of Education every year, we appropriate less than \$60 billion. Transportation, \$51.5 billion. Homeland Security Department, \$35.8 billion. Those three departments combined, Education, Transportation, Homeland Security, less than \$166 billion.

Let us put it into another perspective. In our budget, we expect this year to receive \$790 billion in individual income tax. That is everybody's individual income tax, \$790 billion. About 20 percent of the request and the supplemental, prior supplemental, amount to 20 percent of the entire individual income tax revenue. With these numbers in hand, the CBC's request for a coherent accounting of the funds is appropriate. It is especially appropriate when you consider the prior claims by this administration, such as the cost of the war will be paid by the oil revenues. Those projections turned out to be false. Therefore, this request needs to be supported by specific plans and documentation detailing how the prior supplemental was spent, exactly how this request will be spent, how it will be paid for, including the question of whether we will get multilateral help, what likelihood there will be for future supplemental appropriations to support the war effort. Those questions need to be answered before we can intelligently consider the request before us.

I want to thank the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus for bringing these questions to the forefront to make sure that we have this information before we vote.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK).

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am so glad that we have this hour to be able to let Americans know the things

they need to know about their government. I think it is important since the gentleman from Virginia just finished talking about what this effort and what I call mismanagement has cost the American people and that it will cost the American people. We need to make sure that we understand that we are deficit spending. This is not surplus money. This is deficit spending money. It is like for some of us Americans that are receiving these credit cards through the mail saying that all you have to do is sign the back and call this 1-800 number, you are automatically qualified for \$2,000 and you go out and you spend that \$2,000 at a rate of like 23 percent interest rate. That is the kind of deficit spending that we have right now. We need to continue to have a dialogue on this.

I am very disturbed by some of the things that I am hearing out of this White House and out of the majority party as it relates to the efforts in Iraq. At the top of the week, we had the majority leader of this House on the Republican side saying that he is upset that the White House has not said more and the Defense Department has not said more about the accomplishments in Iraq. I would beg to differ. Yes, there have been some accomplishments in Iraq, but I would beg to differ by the fact that we have troops that do not even have armor in Iraq. I serve on the Committee on Armed Services. We authorize billions, \$480 something billion annually to the Department of Defense. I remember asking some of the individuals in the Department of Defense, Secretary Wolfowitz to be exact, do our troops have adequate body armor? I was told, yes, the front line troops will have adequate body armor. Right now we have troops that are at Walter Reed Hospital and at Bethesda Hospital with wounds that went through the body armor, bullets that went through the body armor that were supposed to protect them.

I think it is also important for us to understand that if this Congress does not start asking the hard questions to this White House and to the Department of Defense we are going to continue to have these special appropriations. We just gave \$78 billion 6 months ago. We are giving \$87 plus billion very soon and it will be more to come. When I say that this is going on, this is just not a convenience issue, this is hurting Leave No Child Behind in education, this is hurting social services. I have seen people brought to the table and called out for mismanagement for far less than the billions of dollars that have been mishandled in this war as it relates to contract services. I think it is important that we have to ask the tough questions. I am so glad that the media and some Members of this Congress have called Vice President CHENEY out on the fact that the connection he claimed in the Sunday show this past Sunday, saying that Saddam Hussein had something to do with 9/11. I

am glad to hear that the President said that is not true today at a press conference before I came on the floor. The reason why that was corrected in a 3-day period or in a 4-day period is that this Congress questioned that. Democrats questioned what the Vice President said. That is why it is important that we have a democracy. That is why it is important no matter what party you are in if you are a Member of this Congress that you must speak out on issues that you know when that information is inaccurate. Intelligence in the past has been stated about chemical weapons, things of that nature. It has been several months now since we have been in Iraq and there are very little chemical weapons to show for our efforts. We have to ask the hard questions on what is the real rebuilding plan for Iraq. We have yet to see that. Our minority leader the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), who is ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations, asked for that yesterday. As of right now, the last I checked, we still have not received it. That is the reason why we have to continue to push for these questions so that it is not a rubber stamp.

The reason why this administration went to the U.N. before they took their preemptive strike or before we took our preemptive strike on Iraq is because the American people said that they wanted them to go to the U.N. Even though they went to the U.N. and we danced and we changed the name of French fries here in the Capitol to freedom fries and did all of these peripheral things, we still went in by ourselves and now we are paying the price. We are now having to go back and say, oh, we like the French. Oh, we feel that Germany and others, we feel that you are good people. We need your help.

If we do not replace diplomacy on the executive branch, then we are in for a costly, costly, long stay in Iraq. It is no longer good enough, Mr. President, for you to say, we're going to be in Iraq as long as we have to be in Iraq. That is not an appropriate answer. An appropriate answer is saying, we are having real negotiations with the Security Council at the U.N., that I am instructing the Secretary of State that we are going to do everything in our power to continue to get more troops in our coalition. You may ask and there are, give or take, 115,000, 125,000 U.S. troops right now on the soil in Iraq. Some 13,000 coalition forces. But last night I saw Secretary Rumsfeld said, oh, we have 60,000 Iraqi police officers that are a part of our security force now. We have to make sure that we are clear. We cannot use metaphors. We cannot allow the Department of Defense nor this White House nor the leadership of this Congress to wiggle out of the tough questions.

I am just as patriotic as the next person. And just because we ask the question of this government that every last

one of us have been voted on to be here to represent our constituents, individuals should not be called out. General Shinseki had to resign because he said this war would cost anywhere from \$120 billion to \$130 billion. Others who have said of an accurate account if we went into this thing by ourselves of what it would cost had to resign. We in this Congress are the only individuals who cannot be fired. We only can be fired by the people, by the American people, and not by an executive action.

So I ask you, and I implore, and I am so glad that the Congressional Black Caucus has taken this stand to be the conscience of this Congress once again. It may not be the appropriate thing in the light of those individuals who consider themselves self-appointed patriots on behalf of our men and women in uniform, but it was this caucus, Democratic Caucus, that are fighting for those individuals who make under \$26,000 to be able to receive a child tax credit, including those individuals that are over there fighting, their children. Republicans said no and are still saying no and say that the bill will not come up. We are saying that we are willing to put the facts and figures here.

I almost feel like a member of the other party who always talked about deficit spending, or used to talk about it. We no longer talk about it now because it is not important. I think it is important that we continue to raise the tough questions, that we continue to be able to ask for an accounting as it relates to private contracts that are being let. This peripheral, this information that is generic about maintenance and reconstruction and turning on the power and making sure they have water and schools, without defining it, can no longer be accepted by this Congress. So it is important that we focus on the fine details. I am so glad that we are here.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I am glad the gentleman raised the issue of the opportunity, that we must take the opportunities that we have to speak out with regard to what is happening in our country.

□ 1800

And the fact is that he is right. Before the war the Congressional Black Caucus raised some very crucial questions, some folks were hollering the word "unpatriotic," and we made it very clear, as we make it clear today that we support our troops 1 million percent. We want them to be at their very best. We want them to be well-equipped. At the same time, we want to make sure that the crucial questions are asked because after all, the people that we represent are the ones who will end up paying the bill. But not only them but their children and their children's children and their children's children's children will be paying this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK).

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, to our distinguished chairman, who continues to keep us focus in speaking to the needs our constituents, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

I rise as one of the 39 members of the Congressional Black Caucus. We represent over 26 million Americans all over this country. The majorities of our districts are not African American. Some are. Most are not. And collectively we call ourselves the conscience of the Congress and the conscience of these United States.

Over the last 10 days after the President's announcement, my office has been inundated with my constituents asking me, What are you going to say? What are you going to do? Are you going to give them a blank check? You already did that. Will you speak up?

And I am so proud of my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus for organizing this action tonight because it is us who have been charged by God to speak out, to work in a bipartisan way in the interests of the people of this great country. I represent over 680,000 people, as many of my colleagues do, and 11 different communities in the State of Michigan. Some of God's finest. Some have served in the Armed Forces. Some have families who have died in the Armed Forces. All of them want us to fight to protect our right of democracy that so many have fought and died for in this country. We come here today and I as a member of the Committee on Appropriations where I hope much of this discussion will be had, and I want to say just from the outset the President proposes and the Congress disposes, and that is our constitutional right; that we as Members of this House, 435 of us, must demand that the committees of jurisdiction receive the supplemental request, that we are able to hold hearings on this request, and that we be able to get information so that we can make those intelligent decisions that our constituents sent us here to do. We have the time. We must act, as the Constitution allows us to, that the appropriate committees, the Select Committee on Homeland Security, that the appropriate committees, the Committee on Appropriations, Defense Subcommittee, authorization, all those committees that are involved, the members, and some of those committees have 60 or 70 people on them, must have an opportunity to hear and see and act on this supplemental request. I implore our leadership to make sure that that happens. Eighty-seven billion dollars now. Less than 6 months ago we gave them \$79 billion because we said we had to do that. The President requested it and we were at war. Unilaterally first striking a country. We have never done that in the history of our country. We call it the Department of Defense because we defend our country. We do not strike a country. Somebody said we ought to change that to the War Department. I am not quite there

yet. We must solve this crisis. And it is an international crisis. It was then and it still is. That, as my colleague has mentioned, is why we are footing much of the bill, and we know this will not be the last supplemental unless we are able to bring in the international community.

There was no intelligence given to this Member and others before our unilateral first strike that said Osama bin Laden and Saddam Hussein were connected. Osama bin Laden, we already know we must find and rid out the terrorists and the terrorism that he has perpetuated on the world, which is why this is an international crisis that we find ourselves in. Osama bin Laden on the one hand, Saddam Hussein on the other, never at all before this unilateral first strike was there any connection, intelligence-wise, that connected the two together. Now, 5½, 6 months later, we are not sure.

The President says that Iraq is the epicenter of terrorism now. The way that we have disrespected the Muslim religion and any religion in this country, we have to think about that. To them it is a religious war. There is something different about a religious war. They think they are in jihad as we read and discuss.

It is so critical at this time that we, as the world leaders, sit down and try to work out in an international way the problems of the world. Terrorism has to stop. No one in the world is safe as long as terrorism is allowed to rear its ugly head wherever it must strike. We already heard \$166 billion should they be successful in getting this. As was mentioned, that is three times more than we spend on education for our children. It is two times more than the Department of Homeland Security has today, and it is nearly three times more than we spend on our transportation budget today.

We have got to protect our troops. We have got to make sure that they are safe. And the parents are saying bring their children home, 18 to 25 years old. Some not properly trained. Some do not have the proper equipment. We are a better Nation than that. That is why the Congressional Black Caucus have come together tonight to talk to America about what we think must happen, and we want the people to fax, write, call, and e-mail their Congresspeople and let them know how they feel. We want the people to fax, call, e-mail and write the White House, let them know how they feel. The power is in the people of America. It always has been and always will be.

So I want to put in the RECORD at this time the principles, the principles that the Congressional Black Caucus adopted on March 18, 2003, and the reassuring of the principles we adopted today and present to the people today. These are the principles that the Congressional Black Caucus must see as we talk about this \$87 billion of the people's tax dollars.

We affirm our stated principles from March of this year. We also affirm our principles from October of 2002. Despite the President's failure to follow our original statement of principles in his decisions leading to the war, we express our full resolve to support and protect our troops and their families. We, the members of the Congressional Black Caucus, believe that the administration should provide an accounting of all funds expended to date that were provided previously appropriated by the Congress, which is the \$79 million for Iraq and Afghanistan, including details about all contracts for work related to Iraq and Afghanistan. We know that there is a problem with many no-bid contracts given out right now, billions of dollars. We want an accounting of that money.

We believe that the President should provide sufficient details about how the proposed funding will be spent to enable Congress and its committees to evaluate separately funding proposed for the protections and maintenance of our troops and funding proposed for rebuilding Iraq. We, the members of the Congressional Black Caucus, as was mentioned, believe our troops should be protected and secure. We also believe that the humanitarian assistance that we are contemplating, some \$20 billion, needs further scrutiny. The investment in their infrastructure when our electric grids are breaking down, we need that here. We need it for our schools. We need it for our health centers.

We, the members of the Congressional Black Caucus, believe that the President should provide full details about how the efforts will be paid for, including a full accounting of Iraqi resources, recovered and anticipated, and how the President proposes to use those resources to reduce or to reimburse the U.S. obligation.

We, the members of the Congressional Black Caucus, believe the President should provide full details about the future obligations of the United States personnel, funding, and decision-making and about how responsibility and authority for these obligations will be shared with the United Nations and/or other nations going forward.

We, the members of the Congressional Black Caucus, believe the administration should provide to Congress full details of information relied on by the President in his decision to go to war in that first unilateral strike earlier this year.

We believe the President should provide details of the criteria he will expect to be met before bringing U.S. troops home and what the exit strategy must be.

Those are the principles that 39 members of the Congressional Black Caucus today present to the President and to our American citizens across this country. They are simple. We want a response. We want it timely. And the 26 million people that we represent want to hear from him.

I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) for his leadership. THE CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS PRINCIPLES REGARDING PRESIDENT BUSH'S \$87 BILLION SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST

We reaffirm our Statement of Principles issued in October 2002.

Despite the President's failure to follow our original Statement of Principles in his decisions leading to the war, we express our full resolve to support and protect our troops and their families.

The Administration should provide an accounting of all funds expended to date that were previously appropriated by the Congress, including details about all contracts for work in or related to Iraq.

The President should provide sufficient details about how the proposed funding will be spent to enable Congress and its Committees to evaluate separately funding proposed for the protection and maintenance of our troops and funding proposed for rebuilding Iraq. Congress should vote on these funding proposals separately.

The President should provide full details about how the efforts will be paid for, including a full accounting of Iraqi resources (recovered and anticipated) and how the President proposes to use those resources to reduce or reimburse the U.S. obligation.

The President should provide full details about the future obligations of the United States (personnel, funding and decisions making) and about how responsibility and authority for these obligations will be shared with the United Nations and/or other nations going forward.

The Administration should provide to Congress full details of information relied on by the President in his decision to go to war.

The President should provide details of the criteria he will expect to be met before bringing US troops home and of his exit strategy.

#### CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS PRINCIPLES ON MILITARY ACTION IN IRAQ

1. We oppose a unilateral first-strike action by the United States without a clearly demonstrated and imminent threat of attack on the United States.

2. Only Congress has the authority to declare war.

3. Every diplomatic option must be exhausted.

4. A unilateral first-strike would undermine the moral authority of the United States, result in substantial loss of life, destabilize the Mideast region and undermine the ability of our nation to address unmet domestic priorities.

5. Further, any post-strike plan for maintaining stability in the region would be costly and would require a long-term commitment.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her statement. And we reiterate that these questions that have been raised are basic questions that if anybody were dealing with a family issue, a serious family issue, these are the kinds of questions, Mr. Speaker, that anybody, any reasonable person would ask, and we reiterate that we hope the President will answer these questions as soon as possible.

Speaking of common sense, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) who hails from South Carolina and also is a previous chair of the Congressional Black Caucus and now serves as a vice chairman of our Democratic Caucus.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to thank the chairman for the tremendous leadership he has given to the Congressional Black Caucus on this and other issues.

Earlier today, I joined the House Democratic leadership in sending a letter to the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT) requesting a detailed accounting of the money being spent on the Iraq War effort. The public disclosure that we are requesting must include shining the light on closed-door lucrative contracts being awarded to Halliburton, Bechtel and other friends of this administration.

In today's Washington Post, there is an article that says that \$1.7 billion has already been awarded to Bechtel, and they stand to receive millions more in no-bid contracts.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this is outrageous. Outrageous not just because of the issue itself but because there are two underlying issues that I think that this administration must confront before we send any additional money to conduct this effort in Iraq. And I want to share with the public those two concerns of mine.

First of all, I do not know if the public realizes it or not, but a law that we authorized last April provides for imminent danger pay of \$75 a month and \$150 a month in family separation allowances for our soldiers serving in Afghanistan and Iraq. That law expires on September 30. I do not believe that we ought to give one moment of consideration to any additional funding to conduct this war in Iraq until we extend this law so that those men and women who are putting their lives on the line, who are in imminent danger, who have been separated from their families receive compensation for doing so.

□ 1815

The Defense Department is saying that we cannot afford to continue this pay. I believe that the troops serving overseas ought to be our top priority, and we ought not talk about any additional expenditures until we make sure that they are taken care of.

The second thing I want us to consider before we start discussing any additional funds for Iraq is this issue involving disability pay for our veterans.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to me that if you were to look at a 20-year veteran who may have served 1 year in Iraq or Afghanistan and comes home unharmed, that veteran will receive retirement benefits. But the 20-year veteran who serves for 20 years and gets injured in Iraq, comes home with a missing limb and becomes eligible for disability pay, that disability pay is deducted from his or her retirement pay; and, therefore, he or she stands in the same light as a person who never got injured in the first place, though that person's ability to make a living for himself or herself and his or her family diminishes greatly because of that injury.

We in this Congress need to correct that issue before we send one additional soldier to fight in Iraq or Afghanistan, and this Congress is refusing to deal with that. Yet we hear that those of us who disapprove spending additional expenditures until we do this do not support our troops.

This is not supporting our troops, when we put them in harm's way and we bring them back home and do not adequately support their life's existence. Something about this is bad wrong. I get the phone calls in my office. I have a young lady spending almost full time dealing with this issue. We believe that until it is resolved, we ought not be talking about any additional funds for Iraq.

So until this administration faces up to these three issues, gives us a light shining on these contracts, does something about extending eminent pay allowances and family separation for our men and women, and does something about this disabled American veterans tax that we are putting on these people returning home with their injuries, I am not going to support any additional expenditures in Iraq.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman, the chairperson of the Congressional Black Caucus. I am honored to join my colleagues in a very thoughtful presentation and edification of our principles.

I rise to say two things, that Congress has to be, if you will, the arbiter, the moral compass, the standard by which we make determinations to save lives in America. It is imperative before we vote for the \$87 billion that we have full congressional hearings, that we separate the vote on the support for the troops as well as distinguishing that from the rebuild on Iraq.

We are truly committed to our troops and saving lives, protecting them and responding to their family needs; but we cannot give a blank check of \$87 billion to this administration without a detailed plan and exit strategy, as well as an understanding of who our allies will be.

Lastly, I believe it is imperative that we not give up on understanding where the weapons of mass destruction are and what was the nuclear capacity or threat at the time that we all made a conscious decision or one of conscience to protect this land in voting for the resolution in 2002. The American people have to have hearings on the understanding of the weapons of mass destruction.

So I support my colleagues and thank them very much for giving me the opportunity to share in support of this Special Order on very important decisions that this Congress will make over the next weeks and days. I look forward to a town hall meeting in my community on this very issue.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chair of the Congressional Black Caucus for yielding. We all owe him particular gratitude for the way in which this entire session he has brought this caucus together on this floor on important issues, none more important than the issue before us today.

If I were to summarize what I have to say today, it would be that the troops have become an abstract concept. I want to deconstruct the concept. The proposition that I want to put forward is that two inexcusable errors by the administration are endangering our troops in Iraq: first, the rush to war without allies, and, secondly, the inexcusable failure to plan for the peace.

The context of what I want to speak about further is a young man whose funeral I went to a couple of weeks ago, Darryl Dent, 21 years old, due home several times, extended each time. Dead.

I believe that the Darryl Dents, who are mounting up every day, are unnecessarily mounting up; and I want to make that case today.

I want to congratulate the Chair once again on his "Statement of Principles as to War against Iraq" that the caucus issued before that war. The most important principle has been vindicated, that a unilateral first strike action by the United States without a clearly demonstrated and indicated threat of attack on the United States, that notion that you do not do that kind of strike unless you know you are in imminent danger, has been fully vindicated by multiple failures of the administration.

I want to spell out what those failures are. First, the failure to form a pre-war and a post-war alliance to provide adequate civilian and military assistance to our troops in the field and to the people of Iraq after the war; the failure to secure the peace; the failure to prepare for the probability of an Iraqi resistance. What did we think they were going to do, just melt into the woodwork? Or, finally, to understand that once there was the chaos of war, we would draw in terrorist elements following the war, the failure to prepare for what U.S. commanders now themselves now call a guerilla war in Iraq. Was all of this necessary, Mr. Speaker? I think not.

It comes up now in the context of an astonishing request. Nobody expected \$87 billion more. What is that, for this year alone?

I want to talk about the troops through Darryl Dent, because I think the words need to be humanized. The only people who have been asked to sacrifice for this war are the military. We certainly have not been asked to sacrifice a thing, whether we are rich or poor, since we are getting tax cuts thrown at us.

The greatest hardship has been on the people we call the Weekend Warriors. You will notice that the Congressional Black Caucus does not feel defensive at all about indicating that we support the troops. We do not need to come forward and let everybody make sure you know we support the troops. That is a truism, particularly since the troops are disproportionately African American.

Mr. Speaker. Yes, we do support them. That is a given as well.

We also believe that once you destroy somebody's country, you invade somebody's country, you ought to fix it up and not simply leave it in chaos. That is the obligation that comes once you invade somebody's country. That is an obligation, by the way, under the U.N. charter.

Winning the war in Iraq was a virtual given. But we had a special obligation not to engage in a war of choice unless we were in imminent danger the moment we decided to have a volunteer Army, because that Army we knew from the outset would be composed disproportionately of Weekend Warriors.

We were under a particular obligation to make sure that we did not call people who we gave to understand that, yes, in the event of a war of last resort you will be called up, but basically there was not much chance that you would be called up. We had no right to go into a war of choice unless we had no other choice. They were prepared to fight a defensive war, they were prepared to fight this war of choice, but it is unfair that we have asked them to do that. They are all surprised. They are as astonished as anybody is. And we are having a snowball effect.

We are having a snowball effect on the troops, on their families, on small businesses, and on employers. We know it, because employers and families are beginning to escalate their use of the mechanism in the Defense Department that allows you to ask for particular troops to come home because of emergency or hardship. Businesses are using that as well. We know it because families are organizing to bring the troops home, for goodness' sake.

And we know one other thing: we had better not get up ever again and declare that we can fight a war on two fronts. We now know we cannot fight a war on two fronts without substantial aid from substantial allies using a military force composed so disproportionately of Weekend Warriors, of people in the Reserves, of people in the National Guard. Nobody can fail to understand that now, particularly when the commanders are calling for troops. They call them "foreign troops," but what they mean is they need reinforcements.

We know they need reinforcements because of the horror stories we are hearing, for example, of people coming home after a year of service and being called back after a few weeks on the job. How long do you think you will have a volunteer Army when you are

treating troops this way? How long? Not long.

In particular, we ought to remember who the National Guard is. They perform triple duty: homeland defense now in the age of domestic terrorism, which is what Americans are truly afraid of; natural disasters, like the hurricane that is bearing down upon us; and, of course, the regular military duty that so many of them are engaged in now. We had better hope and pray we do not need the National Guard at home, because they simply are unavailable to us at the moment.

The administration changed the rules of the game once these young people were signed up and in the field. Now they find that commanders can decide when and if they will go home. They are getting extension after extension of duty, and they are getting back-to-back service, all of which they were promised would almost never happen.

Where does this spring from? From the go-it-alone attack on Iraq that this administration did, against all of the advice of our allies, indeed, of the whole world. The way in which we have handled Iraq has already wrecked American foreign policy and its relations with its allies.

Yes, I support the Congressional Black Caucus statement of principles. I also believe it is time to do more than ask tough questions. It is time to do more than talk about the troops, as if they were some inanimate body. It is time to come to grips with our duty to protect the troops, not only in the field, but here at home, against policies that could wreck the volunteer forces on which we have become so dependent in an age when we do not use the draft.

Mr. Speaker, I again thank the chairman for his leadership.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman and all of the members of the Congressional Black Caucus for participating in this discussion this evening.

□ 1830

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I believe that history will be the judge, and I think it will shine a very favorable light on the Congressional Black Caucus for raising the questions that have been raised. These are basic, fundamental questions.

It is interesting that the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) raised the issue of our troops. It just reminded me that one of the first soldiers to die in the war just so happened to live a few blocks from me, a young man who simply wanted to be the best that he could be; and he joined the Marines, and the reason why he joined the Marines was because he could not get scholarship money to go to college. But he joined the Marines and gave the best that he had, and he became one of the best helicopter specialists in the entire Marine Corps.

So we must never forget the young people who are suffering in 120 degree-

plus weather. We must never forget those who have given the ultimate sacrifice, their lives, for this country. We must never forget them, ever. We must never separate them from what is going on here today, for they are the people that we care so much about and we love so dearly.

At the same time, I think we owe them a certain level of support, the highest level of support. We must do that. At the same time, we must be, this country, that is the President, must answer crucial basic questions about the taxes that are paid. I have often said, Mr. Speaker, that one can get Republicans and Democrats to agree on one thing, and that is for sure, and that is that the tax dollars of our citizens must be spent in an effective and efficient manner. I do believe that it is our duty. It is not only our duty; it is our responsibility to ask the questions of how those dollars are spent. It is the duty of every citizen to require of us in town hall meetings, and when they meet us at the supermarket, to be able to ask us the question of how are our dollars being spent.

And as we stand here today and as we look at this total \$166 billion, I promise my colleagues that I do not think that one of us can truly say how they are being spent, because our President has not told us. This Chamber should be packed with Members trying to get answers to those very crucial questions.

#### CELEBRATING HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RENZI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the majority in the Congress, I take the well this evening to, of course, celebrate Hispanic Heritage Month, to celebrate the independence day for our Central American allies. It is my privilege to be before the House of Representatives today to discuss these important events.

Hispanic Heritage Month is September 15 through October 15. It is a month-long national celebration in recognition of the countless contributions and sacrifices that our Nation's largest minority community has bestowed upon our country over the last 4 centuries. This week we not only recognize Central American independence from Spain, but we also celebrate the common bond of democracy our countries share that allows us all to be here today.

Es gran mes de celebracion porque elegiamos la independencia de cinco paises centro: El Salvador; Costa Rica; Honduras; Guatemala; y Nicaragua. Nuestros amigos y companeros.

As with every July 4th, when we celebrate our Nation's independence from Great Britain, it is fitting to note that while the five Central American na-

tions declared their independence from the Spanish crown on September 15, 1821, the quest for independence actually began 11 years earlier on that exact date when the then Viceroyalty of New Spain, today Mexico, declared her independence from la Madre Patria, the Mother-Fatherland, as Latinos sometimes affectionately refer to Spain.

When independence finally came to Spain's largest American colony in 1821, its vast territory stretched all the way south to the present Costa Rican-Panamanian border and continued northward to the present day California-Oregon border and included the American Southwest.

In addition, the future of the Philippines, Guam, as well as the other Spanish island possessions in the Pacific, which were administered directly from Mexico City before the end of Spanish sovereignty on the American mainland, would also be directly affected by the independence movement that began on this date, September 15 in 1810.

In the years that followed Mexico's independence, which was officially celebrated on the 16th of September, and not on Cinco de Mayo, like some believe, five of the six Central American provinces would also come together in 1823 to form the United Provinces of Central America. Subsequently, Mexico's northern provinces of Alta California, Nuevo Mexico, and Tejas y Coahuila would later come under the Stars and Stripes as a result of the Mexican-American War. Out of these three immense territories, the present-day borders of 10 American States would later be carved out. Hence, there are 10 stars out of the 50 on our national flag, one out of five on our national flag that has a direct tie to this specific date, September 15, the independence day of the former provinces of New Spain. Somos todos hermanos y hermanas.

It is clear that our Nations share many common bonds and values. It is also evident that we stand together, committed to freedom and democracy, proud that all five nations have freely elected governments committed to democracy and the rule of law. There is no better system than democracy, and we in the Republican Congress stand ready to work with the freely elected leaders of our Central American allies to strengthen democracy throughout the Western Hemisphere.

All five nations in Central America are well led by able leaders who again are freely elected. The Republic of El Salvador is President Flores and is represented well here in Washington by His Excellency Ambassador Leon. Republic Costa Rica is well led by a freely elected President, His Excellency President Pacheco and is well served and well represented here in Washington by His Excellency Ambassador Daremblum. The Republic of Honduras is ably led by a freely elected President, His Excellency President Maduro